



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/301,670	04/28/99	CHORNET	AML710857.23

HM12/0413

ALAIN M LECLERC
GOLDREAU GAGE DUBC & MARTINEAU WALKER
THE STOCK EXCHANGE TOWER
800 PLACE VICTORIA SUITE 3400
MONTREAL PQ H4Z 1E9
CANADA

AIR MAIL

EXAMINER
WEBMAN, E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1617	3

DATE MAILED: 04/13/00

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

67/301670

Applicant(s)

CHORNET

Examiner

WEBMAN

Group Art Unit

1617

—The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address—

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Status

- ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 4/28/99
- ☐ This action is **FINAL**.
- ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are pending in the application.
- ☐ Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- ☒ Claim(s) 1-16 is/are rejected.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

- ☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
- ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.
- ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)-(d)

- ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).
- ☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
- ☐ received.
- ☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____.
- ☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 1.7.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). 2
- ☒ Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948
- ☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152
- ☐ Other _____

Office Action Summary

Art Unit: 1617

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7, 14-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dumitriu et al in view of Vasington et al.

Dumitriu et al teach a gel of chitosan and xanthan gum for encapsulation of cells (claims 1,2).

Vasington et al teach the infusion of a gel containing cells with vitamins and amino acids to maintain cell viability (abstract, column 4 lines 6-24). 50 mm/ ml is disclosed (column 6 lines 23-26).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to infuse vitamins and amino acids into the composition of Dumitriu et al to obtain the beneficial effect of maintaining cell viability in view of Vasington et al.

As to the particular claimed vitamins and amino acids, they are well known in the art of cell culture. As to the claimed dermatological product and food additive, intended uses are not considered patentable limitations during prosecution of composition claims. As to the claimed photo- and thermostability, such properties must be inherent in the obvious composition because it is the same as that claimed.

Art Unit: 1617

Claims 1-16 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1-15/01
In claim 1 is "the group consisting of" intended after "selected from" for proper Markush language? "Adapted" is vague; how adopted? ,

In claim 2 "preferably" is vague; what follows is not definitely claimed.


In claim 11 "chosen from" is vague; is "selected from the group consisting of" intended?

No claims allowed.

E. Webman

4/6/00

703-308-4432


EDWARD J. WEBMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 1500